IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.5528 OF 2005

Shrikant Laxman Rane ...Applicant
vs.
The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

WITH

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.6060 OF 2005

Shrikant Laxman Rane ...Applicant
vs.
The State of Maharashtra
(At the instance fo CBI EOW,Mumbai) ...Respondent

Mr.Sanjeev P. Kadam for the Applicant
Ms M.M.Deshmukh,A.P.P. for State

CORAM: A.S.OKA,J.
DATE : SEPTEMBER 19,2005

P.C.:

1. Heard learned Advocate for the Applicant and learned A.P.P. for State. I have also heard learned Counsel for Respondent No.2. In both the cases the offences alleged against the Applicant are under Sections 120-B read with Sections 109, 217, 218, 221, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 465, 467, 468, 471, 472 420 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 63 of Bombay Stamps Act, 1958 and under Section 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. The learned Advocate for the Applicant in both the applications submitted that there is no direct evidence against the Applicant to show his involvement in any larger conspiracy. He submitted that the trial of the case will take a long time and even as of today the Applicant is in custody for more than one and half years. He submitted that the Applicant has already undergone substantial period of sentence which may be awarded in case he is convicted.

2. The learned Counsel for the Respondent No.2 has invited my attention to the material on record and submitted that looking to the seriousness of the crime which affects the economy of the country, the Applicant cannot be enlarged on bail.

3. I have considered the submissions. Statements of Shashikant More and Ashok Rane show involvement of the Applicant in a larger conspiracy. The statement of Shashikant discloses that pre-printed documents affixed with fake Special Adhesive Stamps of were handed over to him by Sanjay Gaikwad and these documents were given to the said Sanjay by prime accused Abdul Karim Telgi to get those documents cancelled with round seal and rubber stamp as "for Superintendent of Stamps, Mumbai". The Applicant was working as a Clerk in the office of General Stamp Office, Mumbai. Shashikant handed over the said documents to the Applicant. The allegation against the Applicant is that he accepted the documents with counterfeit Special Adhesive Stamps and defaced the same. Therefore, it cannot be accepted that there is no material against the Applicant. On the contrary, the material available shows that the Applicant is also a part of the larger conspiracy.

4. There is no reason to take a different view from the one taken by the learned Special Judge. There is no merit in the applications and the same are rejected.

JUDGE